

CRS Report for Congress

Panama: Political and Economic Conditions and U.S. Relations

Updated July 31, 2008

Mark P. Sullivan
Specialist in Latin American Affairs
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Justin Rivas
Research Associate
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division



**Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress**

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 31 JUL 2008		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2008 to 00-00-2008	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Panama: Political and Economic Conditions and U.S. Relations				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, 101 Independence Ave, SE, Washington, DC, 20540-7500				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 32	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Panama: Political and Economic Conditions and U.S. Relations

Summary

With four successive elected civilian governments, the Central American nation of Panama has made notable political and economic progress since the 1989 U.S. military intervention that ousted the regime of General Manuel Noriega from power. The current President, Martín Torrijos of the Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD), was elected in May 2004 and inaugurated to a five-year term in September 2004. Torrijos, the son of former populist leader General Omar Torrijos, won a decisive electoral victory with almost 48% of the vote in a four-man race. Torrijos' electoral alliance also won a majority of seats in the unicameral Legislative Assembly.

The most significant challenges facing the Torrijos government have included dealing with the funding deficits of the country's social security fund; developing plans for the expansion of the Panama Canal; and combating unemployment and poverty. In April 2006, the government unveiled its ambitious plans to build a third lane and new set of locks that will double the Canal's capacity. In an October 2006 referendum on the issue, 78% of voters supported the expansion project, which officially began in September 2007. Panama's service-based economy has been booming in recent years, but income distribution remains highly skewed, with large disparities between the rich and poor.

The United States has close relations with Panama, stemming in large part from the extensive linkages developed when the canal was under U.S. control and Panama hosted major U.S. military installations. The current relationship is characterized by extensive counternarcotics cooperation, assistance to help Panama assure the security of the Canal, and negotiations for a bilateral free trade agreement (FTA). The United States is providing an estimated \$7.7 million in foreign aid FY2008, and could receive up to almost \$4 million in FY2008 supplemental assistance under the Mérida Initiative. For FY2009, the Administration requested \$11.6 million in bilateral foreign aid, not including an additional \$8.9 million under the Mérida Initiative.

The United States and Panama announced the conclusion of a FTA in December 2006, although U.S. officials stated the agreement was subject to additional discussions on labor. Subsequently, congressional leaders and the Bush Administration announced a bipartisan deal in May 2007, whereby pending FTAs, including that with Panama, would include enforceable key labor and environmental standards. On June 28, 2007, the United States and Panama signed the FTA, which included the enforceable labor and environmental provisions. Panama's Legislative Assembly overwhelmingly approved the agreement in July 2007. The U.S. Congress had been likely to consider implementing legislation in the fall of 2007, but the September 1, 2007 election of Pedro Miguel González to head Panama's legislature for one year delayed consideration. González is wanted in the United States for his alleged role in the murder of a U.S. serviceman in Panama in 1992. His term expires September 1, 2008, and González has said that he will not stand for re-election. This could increase the chance that Congress will consider FTA implementing legislation. For more on the bilateral FTA, see CRS Report RL32540, *The Proposed U.S.-Panama Free Trade Agreement*, by J.F. Hornbeck.

Contents

Most Recent Developments	1
Political Conditions	3
From the Endara to the Moscoso Administration	3
Endara Government (1989-1994)	3
Pérez Balladares Government (1994-1999)	3
Moscoso Government (1999-2004)	4
Torrijos Government (2004-2009)	5
May 2009 Elections	7
Human Rights	7
Economic Conditions	9
U.S. Relations	10
Background on the 1989 U.S. Military Intervention	10
Overview of Current U.S.-Panamanian Relations	10
Status of Manuel Noriega	13
Drug Trafficking and Money Laundering	14
U.S. Trade Relations and a Potential Free Trade Agreement	16
Operation and Security of the Panama Canal	18
Historical Background and the Panama Canal Treaties	18
Canal Transition and Current Status	19
Canal Expansion Project	19
Privatization of Two Panamanian Ports and the China Issue	21
Contamination of Firing Ranges and San Jose Island	23
Former U.S. Military Presence in Panama	24
Former Role and Presence of U.S. Troops	25
Failed Negotiations	25
U.S. Congressional Views on U.S. Military Presence	27
Panamanian Views on U.S. Military Presence	28

List of Figures

Figure 1. Map of Panama	29
-------------------------------	----

Panama: Political and Economic Conditions and U.S. Relations

Most Recent Developments

On September 1, 2008, Panama's Legislative Assembly is scheduled to select a new Assembly president for a one-year term. Current Assembly president Pedro Miguel González, wanted in the United States for his alleged role in the murder of a U.S. serviceman in Panama in 1992, has said that he will not stand for re-election. His tenure as president resulted in the delay of U.S. congressional consideration of implementing legislation for a free trade agreement with Panama.

On July 6, 2008, Juan Carlos Varela easily won the presidential primary election as a candidate for the Panameñista Party (PP, formerly the Arnulfista Party) in the May 6, 2009 presidential election. A primary for the Democratic Change (CD) party is scheduled for August 3, 2008, with businessman and former government official Ricardo Martinelli the only candidate. The ruling Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD) is scheduled to hold a primary on September 7, 2008, with former housing minister Balbina Herrera competing against the mayor of Panama City Juan Carlos Navarro.

On May 19, 2008, lawyers for former Panamanian leader Manuel Noriega asked a U.S. appeals court to block his extradition to France on drug-money laundering charges. In January, a U.S. federal judge denied a request to block his extradition. Noriega was scheduled to be released on September 9, 2007, from federal prison in Miami after being imprisoned for nearly 18 years on drug trafficking charges, but will remain in U.S. custody until he exhausts his appeals. Noriega wants to be returned to Panama, where he faces 20 years for conviction on a variety of charges.

On September 3, 2007, Panama officially launched its Canal expansion project, with a ceremony led by former President Jimmy Carter, whose Administration negotiated the Panama Canal Treaties.

On September 1, 2007, Panama's Legislative Assembly elected Pedro Miguel González of the ruling PRD as head of the legislature for a one-year term. The State Department issued a statement expressing deep disappointment about the election of González because of his indictment in the United States for the murder of U.S. Army Sergeant Zak Hernández and the attempted murder of U.S. Army Sergeant Ronald Marshall in June 1992. According to the State Department, there is an outstanding U.S. warrant for his arrest. Although González was acquitted for the Hernández murder in 1997, observers maintain that the trial was marred by jury rigging and witness intimidation. The selection of González has delayed U.S. congressional consideration of the FTA with Panama.

On July 11, 2007, Panama's unicameral Legislative Assembly overwhelmingly approved the bilateral U.S.-Panama free trade agreement by a vote of 58 to 3, with 1 abstention.

On June 28, 2007, Panama and the United States signed a bilateral free trade agreement, which includes enforceable labor and environmental provisions pursuant to the bipartisan trade deal negotiated between congressional leaders and the Bush Administration in May 2007.

From June 3-5, 2007, the General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS) held its 37th regular session in Panama City focused on the theme of "Energy for Sustainable Development."

On May 10, 2007, congressional leaders and the Bush Administration announced a bipartisan trade deal whereby pending free trade agreements, including the Panama free trade agreement, would include enforceable key labor and environmental standards.

On February 16, 2007, President George W. Bush met with President Torrijos in Washington D.C., with talks focused on the pending free trade agreement and the Canal expansion project.

On February 12, 2007, Panama and the United States signed a declaration of principles intended to lead to Panama's participation in the Container Security Initiative (CSI), operated by the Department of Homeland Security, and the Megaports Initiative, run by the Department of Energy.

On December 19, 2006, the United States and Panama announced the conclusion of negotiations for a free trade agreement, but the United States Trade Representative maintained that the agreement would still be subject to additional discussions on labor in order to ensure bipartisan support in the 110th Congress.

On November 7, 2006, Panama was elected to hold a two-year rotating Latin America seat on the U.N. Security Council. The country had emerged as a consensus candidate on November 1, 2006, after 47 rounds of voting between Guatemala and Venezuela. During those rounds, Guatemala, the U.S.-backed candidate, had received about 25-30 votes more than Venezuela, but neither country received the two-thirds vote needed for the seat. Many observers attribute Venezuela's defeat, at least in part, to President Hugo Chávez's strong anti-American speech before the U.N. General Assembly in September. In the context of Panama's close relations with the United States, the election of Panama to the seat bodes well for U.S. interests at the United Nations compared to the potential of Venezuela winning the seat.

On October 22, 2006, Panamanians approved the Torrijos government's Canal expansion project with over 78% support in a national referendum.

In mid-October 2006, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) helped Panama solve the mystery of recent deaths ultimately traced to contaminated cough syrup from China. At least 100 deaths were traced to the contaminant.

Political Conditions

Panama has made notable political and economic progress since the December 1989 U.S. military intervention that ousted the military regime of General Manuel Antonio Noriega from power. The intervention was the culmination of two and a half years of strong U.S. pressure against the de facto political rule of Noriega, commander of the Panama Defense Forces. Since that time, the country has had four successive civilian governments, with the current government of President Martín Torrijos elected in May 2004 to a five-year term. Inaugurated on September 1, 2004, Torrijos is the son of former populist leader General Omar Torrijos. His electoral alliance, led by the Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD), also won a majority of seats in the unicameral Legislative Assembly. Jockeying has already begun for Panama's next presidential and legislative elections scheduled for May 2009.

From the Endara to the Moscoso Administration

Endara Government (1989-1994). Before the U.S. intervention, Panama had held national elections in May 1989, and in the presence of a large number of international observers, the anti-Noriega coalition, headed by Guillermo Endara, prevailed by a three-to-one margin. The Noriega regime annulled the election, however, and held on to power. By the fall, the military regime was losing political power and relied increasingly on irregular paramilitary units, making the country unsafe for U.S. forces and U.S. citizens. On December 20, 1989, President George H.W. Bush ordered the U.S. military into Panama "to safeguard the lives of Americans, to defend democracy in Panama, to combat drug trafficking, and to protect the integrity of the Panama Canal Treaty." Noriega was arrested on January 3, 1990, and brought to the United States to stand trial on drug trafficking charges.

As a result of the intervention, the opposition coalition headed by Guillermo Endara that had won the May 1989 election was sworn into office. During his term, President Endara made great progress in restoring functioning political institutions after 21 years of military-controlled government, and under his administration, a new civilian Public Force replaced Noriega's Panama Defense Forces. But Endara had difficulties in meeting high public expectations, and the demilitarization process was difficult, with some police and former military members at times plotting to destabilize, if not overthrow, the government.

Pérez Balladares Government (1994-1999). In May 1994, Panamanians went to the polls to vote in presidential and legislative elections that observers called the freest in almost three decades. Ernesto Pérez Balladares, candidate of the former pro-Noriega Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD), who led a coalition known as "United People", won with 33% of the vote. Placing a surprisingly strong second, with 29% of the vote, was the Arnulfista Party (PA) candidate, Mireya Moscoso de Gruber, heading a coalition known as the "Democratic Alliance."

In the electoral race, Pérez Balladares campaigned as a populist and advocated greater social spending and attention to the poor. He stressed the need for addressing unemployment, which he termed Panama's fundamental problem. Pérez Balladares severely criticized the Endara government for corruption, and he was able to

overcome attempts to portray him as someone closely associated with General Noriega. (Pérez Balladares served as campaign manager during the 1989 elections for candidate Carlos Duque, who the Noriega regime had tried to impose on the electorate through fraud.) Instead, Pérez Balladares focused on the PRD's ties to the populist policies of General Omar Torrijos, whose twelve-year (1969-1981) military rule of Panama ended when he died in a plane crash in 1981.

President Pérez Balladares implemented an economic reform program and worked closely with the United States as the date of the Panama Canal turnover approached. Under his government, Panama and the United States held talks on the potential continuation of a U.S. military presence in Panama beyond the end of 1999 (the date Panama was to assume responsibility for defending the Canal). Ultimately negotiations ended without such an agreement. (For more see "Former U.S. Military Presence in Panama" below.)

Although Panama's constitution does not allow for presidential reelection, President Pérez Balladares actively sought a second term in 1999. In 1997, the PRD had begun studying the possibility of amending the constitution to allow a second bid for the presidency in the May 1999 elections. Ultimately, a referendum was held on the issue in August 1998 but failed by a large margin.

Late in his administration, Pérez Balladares became embroiled in a scandal involving the illegal sale of visas to Chinese immigrants attempting to enter the United States via Panama. As a result, U.S. officials cancelled the former president's U.S. tourist visa in November 1999.¹

Moscoso Government (1999-2004). In her second bid for the presidency, Arnulfista Party (PA) candidate Mireya Moscoso was victorious in the May 1999 elections. Moscoso, who was inaugurated September 1, 1999, for a five-year term, captured almost 45% of the vote and soundly defeated the ruling PRD's candidate Martin Torrijos (son of former populist leader Omar Torrijos), who received almost 38% of the vote. Until March 1999, Torrijos had been leading in opinion polls, but as the election neared, the two candidates were in a dead heat. A third candidate, Alberto Vallarino, heading a coalition known as Opposition Action, received about 17% of the vote.

President Moscoso, a coffee plantation owner and Panama's first female president, ran as a populist during the campaign, promising to end government corruption, slow the privatization of state enterprises, and reduce poverty. She also promised to ensure that politics and corruption did not interfere with the administration of the Canal. The memory of her husband Arnulfo Arias, a nationalist who was elected three times as president, but overthrown each time, was a factor in the campaign, particularly since Arias was last overthrown in 1968 by General Omar Torrijos, the father of the PRD's 1999 and 2004 presidential candidate.

¹ "Ex-Leader of Panama Linked to Visa Sales," *Washington Post*, November 27, 1999; Pablo Bachelet, "U.S. Uses Visas to Combat Corruption," *Miami Herald*, February 21, 2006.

Although Moscoso took the presidency, the PRD-led New Nation coalition won a majority of 41 seats in the 71-member unicameral Legislative Assembly. Just days before her inauguration, however, Moscoso was able to build a coalition, with the support of the Solidarity Party, the Christian Democratic Party (which later became the Popular Party), and the National Liberal Party, that gave her government a one-seat majority in the Assembly. In August 2000, the Christian Democrats deserted the coalition and formed an alliance with the principal opposition, the PRD. However, corruption scandals in 2002 led to five PRD legislators defecting to support the Moscoso government, once again giving the President majority support in the Legislative Assembly.

As noted above, Moscoso was elected as a populist, with pledges to end government corruption and reduce poverty, but her campaign pledges proved difficult to fulfill amid high-profile corruption scandals and poor economic performance. As a result, the President's popularity declined significantly from a 70% approval rating when she first took office in 1999 to only 15% in 2004.²

Torrijos Government (2004-2009)

On May 2, 2004, Panama held elections for president, as well as for a 78-member Legislative Assembly. In the presidential race, Martín Torrijos of the PRD won a decisive victory with 47.5% of the vote, defeating former President Guillermo Endara, who received 30.6% of the vote, and former Foreign Minister José Miguel Alemán, who received 16.4% of the vote. Torrijos' electoral alliance also won a majority of seats in the unicameral Legislative Assembly, 43 out of 78 seats, which should provide him with enough legislative support to enact his agenda. Elected at 40 years of age, Torrijos spent many years in the United States and studied political science and economics at Texas A&M University. He served four years under the Pérez Balladares government as deputy minister of interior and justice, and as noted above, became the PRD's presidential candidate in the 1999 elections.

Leading up to the election, Torrijos had been topping public opinion polls, with 42%-49% support. In the campaign, he emphasized anti-corruption measures as well as a national strategy to deal with poverty, unemployment, and underdevelopment. He was popular among younger voters and had a base of support in rural areas. Torrijos maintained that his first priority would be job creation.³ He called for the widening of the Canal, a project that would cost several billion dollars, and would seek a referendum on the issue. During the campaign, all three major candidates supported negotiation of a free trade agreement with the United States, maintaining that it would be advantageous for Panama. Endara and Alemán appeared to emphasize the protection of some sensitive Panamanian sectors such as agriculture,

² "Toss Up Between Torrijos and Endara," *Caribbean and Central America Report*, February 17, 2004.

³ Frances Robles, "Ex-leader's Son Wins Presidency in Panama," *Miami Herald*, May 3, 2004.

while Torrijos stressed that such an agreement would make Panama's economy more competitive and productive.⁴

The most significant challenges facing the Torrijos government have included dealing with the funding deficits of the country's social security fund (Caja de Seguro Social, CSS); developing plans for the expansion of the Panama Canal; and combating unemployment and poverty. After protests and a protracted strike by construction workers, doctors, and teachers in June 2005, the Torrijos government was forced to modify its plans for reforming the social security fund. After a national dialogue on the issue, Panama's Legislative Assembly approved a watered-down version of the original plan in December 2005. The enacted reform did not raise the retirement age but will gradually increase required monthly payments into the system and introduces a dual pension system that combines aspects of privatization with the current system.⁵ In mid-December 2007, an almost six-week strike by doctors in the public healthcare system was resolved, with the government offering a 26.7% increase in salaries equivalent and a commitment not to privatize the system.⁶

The government unveiled in April 2006 its ambitious plans to build a third set of locks that will allow larger post-Panamax ships to transit the Canal. Panama's Cabinet approved the expansion plan on June 14, and the Legislative Assembly approved it on July 10, 2006. A referendum on the expansion project took place on October 22, 2006, with 78% supporting the project. The referendum was viewed as a victory for the Torrijos government, which advanced the project as integral to Panama's future economic development, and one that helped restore the President's popularity.⁷

The Torrijos government's agenda also has included judicial, penal and anti-corruption reforms, as well as an economic development strategy to target poverty and unemployment. In May 2008, a new penal code went into effect that takes a tougher stance on crime by increasing sentences on serious crimes and introducing new categories of crimes, including environmental crimes and thefts of energy, water, or telecommunications services.⁸ In early July 2008, Panama's Legislative Assembly gave President Torrijos powers to carry out security sector reforms over the next two months. Some critics fear that the action could remilitarize the country.⁹ In terms of tackling poverty, in June 2008, the government Torrijos extended its "Red de Oportunidades" social support program to include the elderly living in extreme

⁴ "Panama: Presidential Candidates Remark on FTA with US," *La Prensa* (Panama), January 24, 2004, translated by Foreign Broadcast Information Service.

⁵ Marion Barbel, "Panamanian Congress Approves Modified Social Security Reform," *World Markets Research*, December 22, 2005

⁶ "Panama: Country Report," *Economist Intelligence Unit*, January 2008, p. 2.

⁷ Richard Lapper, "Good Luck, Good Timing," *Financial Times*, July 24, 2007.

⁸ "Panama Unveils New Penal Code," *Latin American Weekly Report*, May 29, 2008.

⁹ "Panama: Torrijos to Undertake Security Reform by Decree," *Latin American Weekly Report*, July 3, 2008.

poverty, and in July 2008, the government announced that monthly cash payments under the program would increase.¹⁰

The popularity of the Torrijos government has declined significantly in 2008. A June 2008 poll showed support for the President at 34%, down from 51% in April.¹¹ Increasing inflation and violent crime are significant challenges that reportedly have contributed to the President's decline in popularity. Consumer price inflation was 6.4% at the end of 2007, and is forecast to reach 9.7% at the end of 2008.¹²

May 2009 Elections

Panama is scheduled to hold legislative and presidential elections on May 6, 2009. Since the Constitution does not allow for re-election, President Torrijos cannot be a candidate. As a result, jockeying began in early 2008 among presidential aspirants.

On July 6, 2008, Juan Carlos Varela easily won the presidential primary election for the Panameñista Party (PP, formerly the Arnulfista Party) as a candidate for the 2009 presidential election. A primary for the smaller Democratic Change (CD) party is scheduled for August 3, 2008, with businessman and former government minister Ricardo Martinelli running unopposed. The ruling Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD) is scheduled to hold a primary on September 7, 2008, with former housing minister Balbina Herrera competing against the mayor of Panama City Juan Carlos Navarro. Former President Guillermo Endara will run as the candidate of the Fatherland's Moral Vanguard Party.

Human Rights

The Panamanian government generally respects human rights, but, as noted by the State Department in its 2007 human rights report (issued in March 2008), serious human rights problems continue in a number of areas. Prison conditions overall remain harsh, with reported abuse by prison guards, and prolonged pretrial detentions remained a problem. According to the report, the judiciary is marred by corruption and ineffectiveness, and is subject to political manipulation. Other serious problems include discrimination and violence against women, trafficking in persons, discrimination against indigenous people and other ethnic minorities, and child labor.

Panama had been criticized by the State Department and international human rights groups for vestiges of "gag laws" used by the government to silence those criticizing policies or officials, but the legislature repealed these laws in May 2005. Nevertheless, as noted in the State Department human rights report, the legislature approved penal code amendments in May 2007 that establish fines or arrests of journalists who violate the privacy of public officials, recognize criminal libel against

¹⁰ "Panama: Country Report," *Economist Intelligence Unit*, July 2008, p. 11.

¹¹ "Torrijos Growing Unpopular in Panama," *LatinNews Daily*, June 25, 2008.

¹² "Panama: Country Report," *Economist Intelligence Unit*, July 2008, p. 14.

journalists, and allow the government to prosecute journalists for publishing classified information. The new penal code went into effect in May 2008. The State Department's human rights report maintains that 15 past libel cases against journalists remain pending. It also cites concerns of journalists and human rights organizations that the government attempts to manipulate the free flow of information by using advertising funding to reward news organizations that carry stories favorable to the government.

In an attempt to redress human rights abuses that occurred under military rule and to prevent their reoccurrence, the Moscoso government established a Truth Commission in 2001 to investigate violations under the military regime. The Commission recommended that the government investigate 33 cases of killings or disappearances committed during the 1968-1989 period of military rule, some of which were under review by the end of 2007, however little progress has been made. In July 2006, just as one of the first human rights trials was approaching an end, a former military officer implicated in the 1970 killing of activist Heliodoro Portugal died from an apparent heart attack. There are reportedly 110 human rights cases involving the torture, incarceration, murder, or disappearance of political activists under the period of military-dominated government.¹³

In recent years, violence from the civil conflict in neighboring Colombia has resulted in hundreds of displaced persons seeking refuge in the neighboring Darién province of Panama. The Office of the U.N. High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) reports that there are some 900 displaced Colombians in Panama under temporary humanitarian protection. Their presence is restricted to a small area in the Darién. According to the State Department's human rights report, many of the Colombians have lived in Panama for years, have given birth to children in Panama, and do not want to return to Colombia because of family and cultural ties to local Panamanian communities. While many of the displaced are Afro-Colombians, there have also been indigenous people from Colombia who have fled to Panama because of the violence. In December 2006, Panama recognized 42 members of Colombia's Wounaan indigenous group as refugees.¹⁴

According to UNHCR, there are almost 1,000 recognized refugees in the country. In April 2008, UNHCR lauded Panama for the approval of a new law that will allow long-standing refugees (those residing 10 years or more) the opportunity to apply for permanent residency. According to UNHCR, the new law will largely affect refugees from Nicaragua and El Salvador who arrived in Panama during the Central American conflicts of the 1980s, and will not affect the more recent refugees from Colombia.¹⁵

¹³ Steven Dudley, "Justice Elusive for Victims of Panama's Ex-Dictators," *Miami Herald*, September 29, 2006.

¹⁴ "Panama: First Indigenous Colombians Get Refuge," *UNHCR Briefing Notes*, December 15, 2006.

¹⁵ "UNHCR Welcomes New Panama Law," *UNHCR Briefing Notes*, April 1, 2008.

With regard to worker rights in Panama, the State Department's 2007 human rights report noted that unions and collective bargaining are permitted in export processing zones (EPZs), but that the International Labor Organization's Committee of Experts questioned the government as to whether these workers have the right to strike. Panama's law regulating the EPZs does not include arbitration or specify procedures to resolve labor disputes in the courts. The State Department report also noted that child labor was a problem, with violations occurring most frequently in rural areas at harvest time and in the informal sector.

Economic Conditions

Panama's service-based economy has performed well in the last several years, with economic growth rates of 7.2% in 2005, 8.7% in 2006, and 11.2% in 2007. Continuing to be one of the fastest growing economies in Latin America, the estimate for 2008 is 8.6% growth.¹⁶ With a per capita income level of \$4,890 in 2006, Panama is classified by the World Bank as an upper-middle-income developing country. Yet income distribution remains highly skewed with large disparities between rich and poor, with about one third of the population living in poverty.¹⁷ In October 2005, the Torrijos government launched an anti-hunger and anti-poverty program targeting the rural population and an indigenous community in a central rural province. The government has also begun providing direct monthly subsidies to poor families that can demonstrate that their children attend school regularly.¹⁸ As noted above, the government announced earlier this year that the monthly subsidies would be extended to elderly living in extreme poverty. Unemployment fell from 10.3% in 2005 to 6.4% in 2007, but the forecast for 2008 is just a slight decrease to 6.3%.¹⁹

The administration of President Pérez Balladares (1994-1999) implemented an economic reform program that included liberalization of the trade regime, privatization of state-owned enterprises, the institution of fiscal reform, and labor code reform. Tariffs were reduced to an average of 8%. The Moscoso government partially reversed the trade liberalization process by raising tariffs on some agricultural products, some of which reached the maximum rate allowed under Panama's World Trade Organization obligations.²⁰

Although Panama has traditionally eschewed economic linkages and integration schemes with its Central American neighbors (largely because of its privileged relationship with the United States), it has joined with Mexico and Central American

¹⁶ "Panama: Country Report," *Economist Intelligence Unit*, July 2008, p. 14.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹⁸ Adam Thomson, "Excessive Wealth Fails to Filter Down to the Poor," *Financial Times*, July 24, 2007.

¹⁹ "Panama: Country Report," *Economist Intelligence Unit*, May 2008, p. 13.

²⁰ United States Trade Representative, *2006 National Trade Estimate Report on Foreign Trade Barriers*, p. 501.

states in a regional economic project known as the Puebla-Panama plan. The plan, which has the goal of spurring development in the region, will improve highways, standardize customs procedures, and join power grids to improve the quality of life in the region.

As part of its strategy of increasing its global trade and investment links, and accentuating its role as a global transportation hub, Panama has pursued free trade agreements (FTAs) with several countries, including the United States (see “U.S. Trade Relations and a Potential Free Trade Agreement” section below). In June 2003, an FTA with El Salvador entered into force, and more recently signed agreements with Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Guatemala. In June 2006, Panama signed an FTA with Chile. Beyond the Western Hemisphere, Panama negotiated an FTA with Taiwan that entered into force in January 2004, and in April 2005, Panama and Singapore announced the conclusion of talks for a free trade agreement that was ratified in June 2006.

U.S. Relations

Background on the 1989 U.S. Military Intervention

The December 20, 1989, U.S. military intervention in Panama, known as Operation Just Cause, was the culmination of almost two and a half years of strong U.S. pressure, including economic sanctions, against the de facto political rule of General Noriega, Panama’s military commander. Political unrest had erupted in mid-1987 when a high-ranking Panamanian military official alleged that Noriega was involved in murder, electoral fraud, and corruption, which prompted the formation of an opposition coalition that challenged his rule. The regime nullified the results of May 1989 national elections, which international observers maintain were won by the opposition by a 3-1 margin. It also harassed U.S. citizens in Panama, including the killing of a U.S. Marine lieutenant. President George H. W. Bush ultimately ordered U.S. forces into combat to safeguard the lives of Americans in Panama, to defend democracy, to combat drug trafficking, and to protect the operation of the Panama Canal.

In early January 1990, with the restoration of democracy and Noriega’s arrest to face trial in the United States on drug charges, President Bush announced that the objectives of the U.S. intervention had been achieved. In terms of casualties, 23 U.S. soldiers and three U.S. civilians were killed, while on the Panamanian side, some 200 civilians and 300 Panamanian military were killed. While Congress was not in session during the intervention, in general, Members were strongly supportive of the action. In February 1990, the House overwhelmingly approved a resolution, H.Con.Res. 262, stating the President acted appropriately to intervene in Panama after substantial efforts to resolve the crisis by political, economic, and diplomatic means.

Overview of Current U.S.-Panamanian Relations

Since the 1989 U.S. military intervention, the United States has had close relations with Panama, stemming in large part from the extensive history of linkages developed when the Panama Canal was under U.S. control and Panama hosted major U.S. military installations. Today, about 25,000 U.S. citizens reside in Panama, many retirees of the former Panama Canal Commission, and there are growing numbers of other American retirees in the western part of the country.²¹

The current U.S. relationship with Panama is characterized by extensive cooperation on counternarcotics efforts, U.S. assistance to help Panama assure the security of the Canal, and efforts to complete a bilateral free trade agreement (FTA). Panama is seeking an FTA as a means of increasing U.S. investment in the country, while the Bush Administration has stressed that an FTA with Panama, in addition to enhancing trade, would further U.S. efforts to strengthen support for democracy and the rule of law.

U.S.-Panamanian negotiations for a bilateral FTA began in April 2004, and were completed in December 2006, although at the time U.S. officials stated the agreement was subject to additional discussions on labor and that the Administration would work with Congress to ensure strong bipartisan support. Subsequently, congressional leaders and the Bush Administration announced a bipartisan deal on May 10, 2007, whereby pending FTAs, including that with Panama, would include enforceable key labor and environmental standards. The United States and Panama ultimately signed the FTA on June 28, 2007, which included the enforceable labor and environmental provisions. Panama's Legislative Assembly overwhelmingly approved the agreement on July 11, 2007, by vote of 58 to 3, with 1 abstention. The U.S. Congress had been likely to consider implementing legislation for the agreement in the fall of 2007, but the September 1, 2007, election of Pedro Miguel González to head Panama's legislature for one year delayed consideration of the FTA. González is wanted in the United States for his alleged role in the murder of a U.S. serviceman in Panama, U.S. Army Sergeant Zak Hernández, in June 1992.

The United States turned over control of the Canal to Panama at the end of 1999, according to the terms of the 1977 Panama Canal Treaty, at which point Panama assumed responsibility for operating and defending the Canal. All U.S. troops were withdrawn from Panama at that time and all U.S. military installations reverted to Panamanian control. However, under the terms of the Treaty on the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal, or simply the Neutrality Treaty, the United States retains the right to use military force if necessary to reopen the Canal or restore its operations. U.S. officials congratulated Panama on the success of the October 2006 Canal expansion referendum, but also asserted that the challenge for the government is to ensure that the expansion project is conducted with transparency and without any hint of corruption.²²

²¹ U.S. Department of State, Background Note: Panama, February 2007.

²² U.S. Department of State, U.S. Embassy Panama, "Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Charles S. Shapiro at Panama Week," and "Ambassador Eaton's Remarks at the Panama Week Power Breakfast," October 2006.

In recent years, U.S. foreign assistance amounted to \$19 million in FY2005, \$10.5 million in FY2006, and \$12.2 million in FY2007. For FY2008, about \$7.7 million will be provided through the regular foreign aid funding measure, while Panama also could receive up to almost \$4 million in FY2008 supplemental appropriations assistance under the Mérida Initiative (P.L. 110-252). That program provides assistance to Mexico and Central to combat drug trafficking, gangs, and organized crime. For FY2009, the Administration's FY2009 foreign aid request for Panama was for \$11.6 million, with \$4 million for development assistance, \$2.6 million in military assistance, \$1 million for assistance under the Andean Counterdrug Program (ACP), and \$3.4 million for a Peace Corps program. In addition, Panama could receive an additional \$8.9 million of the \$100 million requested for Central America in FY2009 for the Mérida Initiative under the Western Hemisphere Regional program. (For additional information, see CRS Report RS22837, *Mérida Initiative: Proposed U.S. Anticrime and Counterdrug Assistance for Mexico and Central America*.)

A number of U.S. agencies provide support to Panama. The State Department, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the Department of Homeland Security are involved in providing counternarcotics support to Panama. In October 2006, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) helped Panama solve the mystery of deaths ultimately traced to contaminated cough syrup from China (at least 100 deaths have been traced to the contaminant). The Department of Health and Human Services is providing support for a Regional Training Center for health-care workers in Panama City that will train students from throughout Central America. The U.S. Southern Command also provides support to Panama through military exercises providing humanitarian and medical assistance, and at times provides emergency assistance in the case of natural disasters such as floods or droughts. The U.S. Southern Command also has sponsored annual multinational training exercises since 2003 focused on the defense of the Panama Canal.

In February 2007, Panama and the United States signed a declaration of principles intended to lead to Panama's participation in the Container Security Initiative (CSI) operated by the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) of the Department of Homeland Security, and the Megaports Initiative run by the National Nuclear Security Administration of the Department of Energy. Panama's port of Balboa became operational under the CSI in August 2007, while the ports of Colón and Manzanillo became operational in September 2007. CSI uses a security regime to ensure that containers that pose a potential risk for terrorism are identified and inspected at foreign ports before they are placed on vessels destined for the United States. The Megaports Initiative has the goal of deploying radiation detection equipment to ports in order to detect nuclear or radioactive materials.

A sensitive issue in U.S.-Panamanian relations has been Panama's desire to have the United States clean up three contaminated firing ranges in Panama as well as San Jose Island, which was contaminated with chemical weapons used in training exercises during World War II. With regard to the firing ranges, U.S. officials maintain that the United States has already met its treaty obligations to clean up the ranges. With regard to the cleanup of San Jose Island, Panama rejected a U.S. offer in September 2003 that would have provided equipment and training so that Panama

could clean up the island; the Panamanian government maintains that it did not want to sign any agreement releasing the United States from liabilities.

President Bush visited Panama in November 2005, on his way back from the fourth Summit of the Americas held in Argentina. During the visit, he endorsed the concept of widening the Canal and indicated that the two countries were close to completing negotiations for a free trade agreement. While in Panama, the President also rejected Panama's calls to remove unexploded ordnance from former U.S. firing ranges that were returned to Panama in 1999. According to the President, "we had obligations under the treaty, and we felt like we met those obligations." Despite the disagreement, President Bush indicated that Panama and the United States could discuss the issue in a constructive way since the two countries have friendly relations.²³

In February 2007 and again in May 2008, President Torrijos met with President Torrijos in Washington D.C., with talks focused on the free trade agreement and the Canal expansion project. President Torrijos is expected to visit Washington in mid-September 2008 to promote the approval of the FTA.²⁴

Status of Manuel Noriega. In the aftermath of the 1989 U.S. military intervention, General Manuel Noriega was arrested in January 1990 and brought to the United States to stand trial on drug charges. After a seven-month trial, Noriega was convicted on eight out of ten drug trafficking charges in U.S. federal court in Miami in 1992, and sentenced to 40 years in prison. That sentence was subsequently reduced to 30 years, and then to 20 years. With time off for "good behavior," Noriega was scheduled to be released from jail on September 9, 2007, but has remained in U.S. custody pending appeals of his extradition to France.

France is seeking Noriega's extradition, where he faces a 10-year prison sentence for his conviction in absentia in 1999 on money laundering charges, but would be eligible for a new trial. Despite having lost all previous appeals, on May 19, 2008, Noriega's defense filed an appeal on the grounds that the French government would not respect special protections that were granted to him in a 1992 ruling as a "prisoner of war" under the Geneva Conventions. On January 9, 2008,

²³ White House, Office of the Press Secretary, "President Bush Meets with President Torrijos of Panama," November 7, 2005; Edwin Chen, "Bush's Trip Ends with Discord," *Los Angeles Times*, November 8, 2005; William Douglas, "Bush's Last Stop: Panama," *Miami Herald*, November 8, 2005.

²⁴ "Realizará Torrijos Visita a EU Para Cabildear por TLC," *Agencia Mexicana de Noticias*, July 25, 2008.

a U.S. federal judge in Miami denied a previous request to block the extradition of Noriega to France.²⁵

Noriega wants to return to Panama in order to appeal his convictions in absentia, including for two murders: the brutal killing of vocal critic Hugo Spadafora in 1985; and the killing of Major Moisés Giroldi, the leader of a failed 1989 coup attempt. Panamanian courts sentenced Noriega to at least 60 years in prison, but the law only allows him to serve a maximum sentence of 20 years, and according to some reports, 18 years of Noriega's imprisonment in the United States could be subtracted from his sentence in Panama.²⁶ Nevertheless, according to Panama's attorney general, there are an additional 15 outstanding cases against Noriega, including his responsibility for the deaths of several members of the Panamanian Defense Forces for their involvement in the failed 1989 coup.²⁷

Noriega's attorneys argue that since Noriega has been recognized as a prisoner of war in the U.S. courts, the United States should repatriate him to his native Panama, insisting that this complies with the Geneva Conventions. U.S. officials have argued that France's extradition should be honored because Panama by law does not extradite its nationals.²⁸ Panama had filed an extradition request for Noriega in 1991.

While Panamanian officials have called for Noriega's extradition to Panama, they have not opposed the possibility of Noriega being extradited to France and have stated that the government would respect the decision of the U.S. courts on this matter. Some observers maintain that the Panamanian government is reluctant to have Noriega extradited to Panama, since some members of the ruling Democratic Revolutionary Party worked with Noriega when he controlled the government and are now reluctant to have Noriega return and revisit cases from the past. Other observers contend that Panamanian officials are reluctant to have Noriega return because of recent changes to the penal code that could allow Noriega to serve little, if any, of his sentence.²⁹

Drug Trafficking and Money Laundering

An important concern for U.S. policymakers over the years has been securing Panamanian cooperation to combat drug-trafficking and money-laundering. Panama is a major transit country for illicit drugs from South America to the U.S. market because of its geographic location and its large maritime industry and containerized

²⁵ Kirk Simple, "Noriega Loses Another Round," *New York Times*, January 10, 2008.

²⁶ Kathia Martinez, "A Homecoming for Noriega after Miami Release? Many Hope Not," *Associated Press Newswires*, August 12, 2007.

²⁷ "Torrijos on Edge over Noriega Release," *Latin American Regional Report, Caribbean and Central America*, August 2007.

²⁸ Carmen Gentile, "Noriega Court Bid Called a Charade; Aims to Avoid Extradition," *Washington Times*, August 14, 2007.

²⁹ Marc Lacey, "An Ambivalent Panama Weighs Noriega's Debt and Threat," *New York Times*, July 29, 2007.

seaports. Moreover, the country's service-based economy, with a large banking sector and trading center (Colón Free Zone), makes Panama a significant drug money laundering center.

Drug traffickers use fishing vessels, cargo ships, small aircraft, and go-fast boats to move illicit drugs — primarily cocaine, but also heroin and Ecstasy — through Panama. Some of the drugs are transferred to trucks for northbound travel or are placed in sea-freight containers for transport on cargo vessels. Traffickers also utilize hundreds of abandoned or unmonitored airstrips as well as couriers who transit Panama by commercial air flights. There also has been increasing domestic drug abuse, particularly among youth. Addiction has also increased significantly among Panama's Kuna indigenous population, whose lands lie just south of a transit zone for Colombian cocaine.³⁰ The country is also a small-scale producer of coca leaf in the remote Darien province that borders Colombia. According to the Department of State, security in Darien has improved in recent years, although the smuggling of weapons and drugs across the border continues.

The State Department's March 2008 *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report* (INCSR) states that the Torrijos administration has been "dynamic" in cooperating with the United States on joint counternarcotics efforts, but maintains that it has been less rigorous in cooperating with neighboring countries. The United States has provided equipment, training, and information to enhance Panama's interdiction and eradication capabilities, and is supporting the restructuring of Panama's law enforcement agencies to enhance their abilities. Looking ahead, the INCSR report encourages Panama to devote sufficient resources to patrol its land borders with Colombia and Costa Rica and its coastline, and to increase the number of arrests and prosecutions in the areas of corruption and money laundering. It also states that the United States will provide expertise and resources to assist Panama develop a new Coast Guard and a border control unit.

Over the past three years, Panamanian cooperation with U.S. law enforcement led to several major successful anti-drug operations. In January 2006, more than 20 people were arrested in New York and Panama in a heroin smuggling operation involving dozens of "swallowers" who transported the drug. In May 2006, law enforcement authorities from the United States, Panama, and several other countries broke up a cocaine smuggling operation that used three islands on Panama's Caribbean coast to refuel fast boats and fishing trawlers carrying drugs. According to the State Department's 2008 INCSR report, in 2007 a record 60 metric tons of cocaine were seized. In March 2007, U.S. and Panamanian authorities cooperated in the interdiction of more than 21 tons of cocaine off the coast of Panama, valued at nearly \$300 million, the largest seizure in U.S. history.

Panama has made significant progress in strengthening its anti-money laundering regime since June 2000 when it was cited as a non-cooperative country in the fight against money laundering by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF),

³⁰ Chris Kaul, "A New Foe Threatens Tribe's Independent Spirit," *Los Angeles Times*, January 3, 2006; "Panama Tribe Faces Threat as Cocaine Comes Ashore," Reuters, February 18, 2006; "Panama's Kuna Fear Drug Threat," *Latin American Weekly Report*, February 1, 2007.

a multilateral anti-money laundering body. Subsequently, the government undertook a comprehensive effort to improve its anti-money laundering regime by enacting two laws and issuing two decrees in 2000. As a result of these efforts, the FATF removed Panama from its non-cooperative country list in June 2001.

Nevertheless, the State Department's March 2008 INCSR maintains that Panama "remains vulnerable to money laundering because of its lack of adequate enforcement, personnel, and resources, the sheer volume of economic transactions, its location as a major drug transit country, and corruption." As such, Panama continues to be categorized by the Department of State as a country of primary concern for money laundering. The INCSR report notes that Panama has continued to make progress in strengthening its anti-money laundering regime, and has cooperated with the United States and other countries in investigating money laundering cases involving Panama. Looking ahead, the report called on Panama to consider adopting legislation to allow for civil forfeiture and the freezing of terrorist assets, and to enhance law enforcement actions that address smuggling, abuse of the real estate sector, trade-based money laundering, and the proliferation of nontransparent offshore companies.

U.S. Trade Relations and a Potential Free Trade Agreement

Panama has largely a service-based economy, which historically has run a merchandise trade deficit with the United States. In 2007, the United States had a \$3.4 billion trade surplus with Panama, exporting \$366 million in goods and importing \$3.7 billion. Panama was the 42nd largest U.S. export market in 2007.³¹ Panama's major exports include fish and seafood (accounting for one-third of its exports to the United States), sugar, coffee, and other agricultural products. Major imports include oil, consumer goods, foodstuffs, and capital goods. Almost half of Panama's exports are destined for the United States, while almost one-third of its imports are from the United States. The stock of U.S. foreign investment in Panama was estimated at \$5.7 billion in 2006, largely concentrated in the financial and wholesale sectors. This surpassed the combined U.S. foreign investment in the five other Central American nations.³²

With the exception of two years (1988-1989), when the United States was applying economic sanctions on Panama under General Noriega's rule, Panama has been a beneficiary of the U.S. preferential import program known as the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) begun in 1984. The program was amended several times and made permanent in 1990. CBI benefits were expanded in 2000 with the enactment of the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act (CBTPA) (Title II, P.L. 106-200), which provided NAFTA-equivalent trade benefits, including tariff preferences for textile and apparel goods, to certain CBI countries, including Panama, until September 30, 2008.

³¹ United States Trade Representative, 2008 National Trade Estimate Report on Foreign Trade Practices.

³² U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, "Survey of Current Business," September 2007, p. 93.

Panama and the United States began negotiations for a free trade agreement in April 2004. There had been expectations that the negotiations would be completed in early 2005, but continued contention over several issues and a lengthy hiatus prolonged the negotiations until December 2006. These included market access for agricultural products, considered sensitive by Panama; procurement provisions for the Panama Canal Authority regarding expansion activities; and sanitary control systems governing the entry of U.S. products and animals to enter the Panamanian market. Negotiations were suspended for some time in 2006 until after Panama held its Canal expansion referendum in October, but a tenth round led to the conclusion of negotiations on December 19, 2006.

Under the agreement, over 88% of U.S. exports of consumer and industrial goods would become duty-free immediately, while remaining tariffs would be phased out over 10 years. Over 50% of U.S. agricultural exports to Panama would become duty-free immediately, while tariffs on most remaining farm products would be phased out within 15 years. In December 2006, Panama and the United States also signed a bilateral agreement on sanitary and phytosanitary measures in which Panama will recognize the equivalence of the U.S. food safety inspection to those of Panama and will no longer require individual plant inspections. Under the FTA, U.S. companies would be guaranteed a fair and transparent process to sell goods and services to Panamanian government entities, including the Panama Canal Authority.³³

When the negotiations were concluded, U.S. Trade Representative Susan Schwab stated that the agreement would be subject to additional discussions on labor, and that the Administration would work with both sides of the aisle in Congress to ensure strong bipartisan support before submitting it to Congress.³⁴ On May 10, 2007, congressional leaders and the Bush Administration announced a bipartisan trade deal whereby pending free trade agreements would include enforceable key labor and environmental standards. This would include an obligation to adopt and maintain in practice five basic internationally recognized labor principles: freedom of association; recognition of the right to collective bargaining; elimination of forced or compulsory labor; abolition of child labor; and elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

The United States and Panama ultimately signed the FTA on June 28, 2007, with the enforceable labor and environmental standards outlined in the bipartisan trade deal. Panama's Legislative Assembly ratified the agreement on July 11, 2007, by a vote of 58 to 3, with 1 abstention.

The U.S. Congress had been likely to consider implementing legislation for the agreement in the fall of 2007, but the September 1, 2007, election of Pedro Miguel González of the ruling PRD to head Panama's legislature for one year delayed consideration of the FTA. González is wanted in the United States for his alleged role in the murder of U.S. Army Sergeant Zak Hernández and the attempted murder

³³ Office of the United States Trade Representative, "Free Trade with Panama, Brief Summary of the Agreement," December 19, 2006.

³⁴ Rosella Brevetti, "Panama, United States Conclude Negotiations on Free Trade Pact," but Labor Issues Remain," *International Trade Daily*, December 20, 2006.

of U.S. Army Sergeant Ronald Marshall in June 1992. The State Department issued a statement expressing deep disappointment about the election of González because of his October 1992 indictment in the United States for the murder of Sergeant Hernández. Although González was acquitted in Panama in 1997 for the Hernández murder, observers maintain that the trial was marred by jury rigging and witness intimidation. González denies his involvement, and his lawyer asserts that ballistic tests in the murder were inconclusive. While polls in Panama in 2007 showed that Panamanians believed that González should step down, the case also energized the populist anti-American wing of the ruling PRD.³⁵

González has stated he will not seek a second term as president of the Legislative Assembly when his term expires on September 1, 2008. This could increase chances that Congress will consider implementing legislation for the FTA.

For more details on the bilateral FTA, see CRS Report RL32540, *The Proposed U.S.-Panama Free Trade Agreement*, by J.F. Hornbeck.

Operation and Security of the Panama Canal

Historical Background and the Panama Canal Treaties. When Panama proclaimed its independence from Colombia in 1903, it concluded a treaty with the United States for U.S. rights to build, administer, and defend a canal cutting across the country and linking the Pacific and Atlantic oceans. (See **Figure 1**, *Map of Panama*, at the end of this report.) The treaty gave the United States rights in the so-called Canal Zone (about 10 miles wide and 50 miles long) “as if it were sovereign” and “in perpetuity.” Construction of the canal was completed in 1914. In the 1960s, growing resentment in Panama over the extent of U.S. rights in the country led to pressure to negotiate a new treaty arrangement for the operation of the Canal. Draft treaties were completed in 1967 but ultimately rejected by Panama in 1970.

New negotiations ultimately led to the September 1977 signing of the two Panama Canal Treaties by President Jimmy Carter and Panamanian head of government General Omar Torrijos. Under the Panama Canal Treaty, the United States was given primary responsibility for operating and defending the Canal until December 31, 1999. (Subsequent U.S. implementing legislation established the Panama Canal Commission to operate the Canal until the end of 1999.) Under the Treaty on the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal, or simply the Neutrality Treaty, the two countries agreed to maintain a regime of neutrality, whereby the Canal would be open to ships of all nations. The U.S. Senate gave its advice and consent to the Neutrality Treaty on March 16, 1978, and to the Panama Canal Treaty on April 18, 1978, both by a vote of 68-32, with various amendments, conditions, understandings, and reservations. Panama and the United States exchanged instruments of ratification for the two treaties on June 16, 1978, and the two treaties entered into force on October 1, 1979.

³⁵ Marc Lacey, “Fugitive from U.S. Justice Leads Panama’s Assembly,” *New York Times*, November 28, 2007.

Some treaty critics have argued that Panama did not accept the amendments, conditions, reservations, and understandings of the U.S. Senate, including the DeConcini condition to the Neutrality Treaty. That condition states: “if the Canal is closed, or its operations are interfered with, the United States of America and the Republic of Panama shall each independently have the right to take such steps as each deems necessary, in accordance with its constitutional processes, including the use of military force in the Republic of Panama, to reopen the Canal or restore the operations of the Canal, as the case may be.” However, others argued that Panama, in fact, had accepted all U.S. Senate amendments. The State Department asserted that Panama expressly accepted all amendments, conditions, and understandings to the two treaties, including the DeConcini condition. The United States and Panama signed the instruments of ratification for both treaties, which incorporated all the Senate provisions. The two countries cooperated throughout the years on matters related to the canal and established five binational bodies to handle these issues. Two of the bodies were set up to address defense affairs and conducted at least sixteen joint military exercises between 1979 and 1985 involving Panamanian and U.S. forces.

Canal Transition and Current Status. Over the years, U.S. officials consistently affirmed a commitment to follow through with the Panama Canal Treaty and turn the Canal over to Panama at the end of 1999. That transition occurred smoothly on December 31, 1999. The Panama Canal Treaty terminated on that date, and the Panama Canal Commission (PCC), the U.S. agency operating the Canal, was succeeded by the Panama Canal Authority (ACP), a Panamanian government agency established in 1997.

Under the terms of the Neutrality Treaty, which has no termination date, Panama has had responsibility for operating and defending the Canal since the end of 1999. As noted above, both Panama and the United States, however, in exercising their responsibilities to maintain the regime of neutrality (keeping the Canal secure and open to all nations on equal terms) independently have the right to use military force to reopen the Canal or restore its operations. This is delineated in the first condition of the Neutrality Treaty.

The secure operation of the Panama Canal remains a U.S. interest since about 13%-14% of U.S. ocean-borne cargo transits through the Canal. The United States provides assistance to Panama to improve its ability to provide security for the Canal and to enhance port and maritime security. U.S. officials have consistently expressed satisfaction that Panama is running the Canal efficiently, and since 2003, the U.S. military has conducted exercises with Panama and other countries to protect the Canal in case of attack.³⁶

Headed by Alberto Alemán Zubieta, the Panama Canal Authority has run the Canal for more than seven years and has been lauded for increasing Canal safety and efficiency. In January 2006, the Martín Torrijos government established a social

³⁶ Senate Committee on Armed Services, Hearing, “Testimony on United States Southern Command, United States Northern Command, and United States Joint Forces Command in Review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2008 and the Future Years Defense Program,” March 22, 2007, *Federal News Service*.

investment fund backed by Panama Canal revenues that will invest in schools, hospitals, bridges, roads, and other social projects. The initiative, according to the government, would show Panamanians that the Canal is contributing to economic development and improving the quality of life for Panamanians.³⁷

Canal Expansion Project. On April 24, 2006, the Panama Canal Authority presented to President Torrijos its recommendation to build a third channel and new set of locks (one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific) that will double the capacity of the Canal and allow it to accommodate giant container cargo ships known as post-Panamax ships. The proposal would also widen and deepen existing channels and elevate Gatun Lake's maximum operating level. According to the proposed plan, the overall project would begin in 2007 and take from seven to eight years to complete. The estimated cost of the project is \$5.25 billion, to be self-financed by the ACP through graduated toll increases and external bridge financing of about \$2.3 billion that would be paid off in about 10 years. The Panamanian government would not incur any sovereign debt as a result of the project. According to the ACP, the overall objectives of the expansion project are to (1) achieve long-term sustainability and growth for the Canal's financial contributions to the Panamanian national treasury; (2) maintain the Canal's competitiveness; (3) increase the Canal's capacity to capture the growing world tonnage demand; and (4) make the Canal more productive, safe, and efficient.³⁸

President Torrijos and his Cabinet approved the expansion project on June 14, 2006, and the Legislative Assembly overwhelmingly approved it on July 10, 2006, with 72 out of 78 deputies voting for the project. Pursuant to Panama's Constitution (Article 319), the project had to be submitted to a national referendum no sooner than 90 days from the date of approval by the Assembly. The Torrijos government chose to hold the referendum on October 22, 2006, close to the anniversary of October 23, 1977, the date when Panamanians approved the two Panama Canal treaties in a national plebiscite by a two-to-one margin. A poll from early September 2006 showed almost 64% public support for the Canal expansion project, but on election day the expansion project received 78% of the vote.

The referendum in part can also be viewed as support for the Torrijos government, which advanced the project as integral to Panama's future economic development. The government maintains that some 7,000 direct jobs will be created by the project, as well as some 35,000 indirect jobs. President Torrijos asserts that increased revenue from the Canal arising from the expansion project will allow the government to launch social development programs and improve living conditions in the country.³⁹

³⁷ Rainbow Nelson, "Canal Cash to Pay for Social Development," *Lloyd's List*, January 18, 2006.

³⁸ Autoridad del Canal de Panama (ACP), "Proposal for the Expansion of the Panama Canal, Third Set of Locks Project," April 24, 2006.

³⁹ "Panama: Torrijos Wins Backing to Expand Canal," *Latin American Weekly Report*, October 24, 2006; "Panama's Torrijos on Referendum Results: 'Opportunity to Materialize Our Hopes,'" Open Source Center (*Panama City TVN*), October 23, 2006.

There had been some vocal opposition to the Canal expansion project. The organization known as the Peasant Coordinator Against the Dams (CCCE, Coordinadora Campesina Contra los Embalses), consisting of agricultural, civil, and environmental organizations, asserts that the expansion project will lead to flooding and will drive people from their homes. An umbrella protest group known as the National Front for the Defense of Economic and Social Rights (Frenadeso), which was formed in 2005 during protests against social security reforms, called for a “no” vote.⁴⁰ Former Presidents Jorge Illueca and Guillermo Endara, as well as former Panama Canal administrator Fernando Manfredo, also opposed the expansion project, maintaining that the price is too high and too much of a gamble. Critics fear that the total price tag could rise considerably and are concerned that toll increases could make alternative routes more economically attractive.⁴¹

The ACP is moving ahead with the Canal expansion project. In April 2007, Panama announced plans for new toll fees to be implemented gradually beginning in July 2007. In early May, the ACP offered its first construction tender for the project. The Panamanian government officially launched the Canal expansion project on September 3, 2007, with a ceremony led by former President Jimmy Carter whose Administration negotiated the Panama Canal Treaties.

Privatization of Two Panamanian Ports and the China Issue. A controversy that arose in U.S.- Panamanian relations in 1996 and continued through 1999 relates to the privatization of two Panamanian ports at either end of the Panama Canal, Balboa on the Pacific and Cristobal on the Atlantic. In July 1996, the Panamanian government awarded the concession to operate the ports to a Hong Kong company, Hutchison International Port Holdings, one of the world’s largest container port operators and a subsidiary of the Hutchison Whampoa Limited Group. The company operates the concession in Panama as the Panama Ports Company, S.A.

Then U.S. Ambassador to Panama William Hughes complained about the lack of transparency in the bidding process in which several U.S. companies competed. The Panamanian government responded with a communique describing the process by which Hutchison was awarded the 25-year concession. Panamanian officials maintain that Hutchison had the highest bid, agreeing to pay Panama \$22.2 million annually over the life of the concession. In May 1997, six U.S. Senators charged in a letter to the Federal Maritime Commission that irregularities in the bidding process denied U.S. companies an equal right to develop and operate terminals in Panama. After a review of the issue, the Commission responded that while the port award processes were unorthodox and irregular by U.S. standards, it saw no evidence that U.S. companies were subjected to discriminatory treatment. A May 1997 Senate

⁴⁰ “Torrijos Appeals for Approval of Canal Expansion,” *Latinnews Daily*, September 1, 2006.

⁴¹ “Panama: Torrijos Reveals Plans to Expand Canal,” *Latinnews Daily*, April 25, 2006; Chris Kraul and Ronald D. White, “Panama is Preparing to Beef up the Canal,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 24, 2006; John Lyons, “Panama Takes Step Toward Expanding the Canal,” *Wall Street Journal*, April 24, 2006.

Foreign Relations Committee staff report on the issue also concluded that while the bidding process was unorthodox, U.S. officials found no evidence of illegality.⁴²

In addition to the privatization process, some press reports in March 1997 raised the issue of Hutchison's relationship with the Chinese government and the China Ocean Shipping Company (COSCO) and suggested that China would gain control of the Panama Canal or threaten the operation of the Canal. Over the years, U.S. officials, however, have consistently confirmed that Hutchison's operations of the ports does not constitute a threat to the Canal. The same May 1997 Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff report mentioned above concluded that legal safeguards in the Panama Canal Treaties and Panamanian law guarantee the continued operation of the Canal and ensures its access to all nations. (Also see CRS Report 97-476, *Long Beach: Proposed Lease by China Ocean Shipping Company (COSCO) at Former Naval Base* by Shirley Kan.)

In early August 1999, Senator Trent Lott raised questions about Chinese influence over the Canal in a letter to Defense Secretary William Cohen. Subsequently, both the State Department and the Department of Defense made statements responding to the concerns raised about potential Chinese influence in Panama. In an August 12, 1999, press briefing, the Department of Defense noted that it does not consider Hutchison's ownership of two port facilities as a threat to U.S. security. DOD asserted that "the company does not have any ability to stop or impede traffic through the Canal" and noted that under the Neutrality Treaty, "the United States has a unilateral right to maintain the neutrality of the Canal and reopen it if there should be any military threat." The State Department, in an August 12, 1999, press briefing, noted that it has seen "no capability or interest on the part of the People's Republic of China, a major user of the Canal, to disrupt its operations."

According to September 29, 1999, congressional testimony by Peter Romero, then Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs (before the House International Relations Committee, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere), the U.S. intelligence community also studied the question of the influence of China in Panama as a result of the concession. Romero testified that, after reviewing the study, the State Department concluded that the Hutchison concession "does not represent a threat to canal operations or other U.S. interests in Panama."

On October 22, 1999, the Senate Armed Services Committee held a hearing on Canal security. Officials from the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal Commission, the SOUTHCOM, and the Department of State testified, and all concluded that the Hutchison's port operations did not constitute a threat to the Canal. Ambassador Lino Gutierrez, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, stated that the Department found no information to substantiate the allegation that Hutchison is a front for the People's Republic of China. He noted that Panama's contract with Hutchison (Law 5) does not give China any role in determining which ships will pass through the Canal or in which order they will travel, and it does not give Hutchison any control over Canal pilots.

⁴² Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. *Staff Report on the Privatization of Panamanian Ports*. May 1997.

Alberto Aleman Zubieta, Administrator of the Panama Canal Commission, stated that “Hutchison has no authority whatsoever to interfere with, dictate or influence the operation of the Canal, nor will it ever be allowed to do so.” Gen. Charles Wilhelm, SOUTHCOM Commander in Chief, stated: “We are not aware of any current internal or external threats to the Panama Canal, and we have no evidence that it has been targeted by terrorists or foreign governments.”

In April 2004, the issue of Hutchison’s operations of the ports was raised during a hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee. In response to a question, General James T. Hill, Commander of SOUTHCOM, asserted that Hutchison’s operations of the ports in Panama have not had a negative impact on the security of the Canal.⁴³

Contamination of Firing Ranges and San Jose Island

Another issue in relations has been Panama’s desire to have the United States clean up three former firing ranges (Empire, Piña, Balboa West) used by the U.S. military for live-fire exercises and testing of ground explosives during its tenure in the country. The Piña range was turned over to Panama in June 1999, while the Empire and Balboa West ranges were turned over in July 1999. Some 60,000 Panamanians live in areas surrounding the ranges, and reportedly at least 24 Panamanians have been killed in the last two decades by coming into contact with the explosives.⁴⁴ Estimates of the cost to clean up the unexploded bombs and other contaminants range from \$400 million to \$1 billion.⁴⁵

U.S. officials maintain that it is not possible to remove the unexploded ordinance without tearing down the rain forest and threatening the Canal’s watershed. They also point to a Canal treaty provision which states that the United States is obligated to take all measures “insofar as may be practicable” in order to ensure that hazards to human life, health and safety were removed from the defense sites reverting to Panama. In response to a press question while attending Panama’s centennial celebration in November 2003, Secretary of State Colin Powell maintained that the United States had already met its obligations to clean up the ranges.⁴⁶

The controversy over the U.S. cleanup of the ranges at times has been an irritant in the bilateral relationship, but at this juncture appears to be somewhat of a dormant issue. Officials of the Pérez Balladares government (1994-1999) believed that the United States was reneging on its treaty commitment and wanted to press the United

⁴³ Hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee, “Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2005,” April 1, 2004, *Federal News Service*.

⁴⁴ “No Home on Panama’s Range, U.S. Munitions Scattered Over Canal Training Zones,” *Washington Post*, January 10, 2000; Vanessa Hua, “U.S. Weapons, U.S. Mess? Panama,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, July 1, 2002.

⁴⁵ “An Expensive Farewell to Arms: The U.S. Has Abandoned 51 Military Sites in Canada,” *The Gazette (Montreal)*, April 28, 2001.

⁴⁶ U.S. Department of State. International Information Programs. Washington File. “Colin Powell Hails Panama’s 100 Years of Independence,” November 3, 2004.

States to clean up the firing ranges regardless of economic cost. The Moscoso government raised the issue during her October 19, 1999, meeting with then President Clinton in Washington. At the time, President Clinton stated that the United States had met its treaty obligations to clean up the ranges to the extent practicable, but did say that the United States wanted to stay engaged and work with Panama on the issue. The issue also came up during then Secretary of State Albright's visit to Panama on January 15, 2000. In a December 2001 letter to Secretary of State Colin Powell, Panama's Foreign Minister reiterated his country's call to clean up the three firing ranges.⁴⁷ In April 2003, Panamanian Foreign Minister Harmodio Arias asserted that the issue of clearing the firing ranges was not dead.⁴⁸ As noted above, during a November 2005 visit to Panama, President Bush reiterated the view that the United States had met its obligations under the treaty.

On another sensitive issue, U.S. Embassy officials in Panama announced in May 2002 that a plan was being prepared to clean up Panama's San Jose Island, which was contaminated with chemical weapons used in training exercises during World War II.⁴⁹ The Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapon (OPCW) had confirmed in July 2001 that there were several live chemical bombs on the island, and Panama evacuated residents of the island.⁵⁰ In September 2003, however, Panama rejected a U.S. offer for the environmental cleanup of the island that would have reportedly offered more than \$2 million in equipment and training so that Panama could clean up the island. According to Foreign Minister Harmodio Arias, Panama rejected the offer because it did not want to sign a document releasing the United States from all liabilities.⁵¹ A provision in the FY2004 Foreign Operations appropriations measure (P.L. 108-199, Division D) would have permitted Foreign Military Financing for the San Jose Island cleanup.

During a November 2004 visit to Panama, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld indicated that issues involving both the firing ranges and San José Island were considered closed.⁵² At the time, Panamanian officials, however, maintained that both were pending bilateral issues.⁵³

⁴⁷ "Panama Asks U.S. Military to Clean Up Former Bases," *Agence France Presse*, December 27, 2001.

⁴⁸ Foreign Broadcast Information Service, Highlights: Central America Press, April 8, 2003 ("Panamanian Foreign Minister Says Firing Range Cleanup Not Dead Issue," *La Prensa*)

⁴⁹ "U.S. Creates Chemical Weapon Clean-up Plan on Panamanian Island." *EFE News Service*, May 27, 2002.

⁵⁰ "Panama-U.S. Panama Clears Isle After Finding World War II Chemical Weapons." *EFE News Services*, September 6, 2001.

⁵¹ Victor Torres, "Foreign Minister Explains Why Panama Rejected U.S. San Jose Island Cleanup Offer," *La Prensa* (Panama), October 12, 2003 (as translated by Foreign Broadcast Information Service).

⁵² "Donald H. Rumsfeld Holds Joint News Conference with the Panamanian Minister of Government & Justice," *FDCH Political Transcripts*, November 13, 2004.

⁵³ "Donald Rumsfeld in Panama Says Contaminated Firing Ranges 'Closed Case,'" *BBC Monitoring International Reports*, November 14, 2004.

Former U.S. Military Presence in Panama

Under the terms of the Panama Canal Treaty, all U.S. military forces withdrew from Panama by December 31, 1999, since no mutual agreement was reached to continue their presence. At that time, Panama assumed responsibility for defending as well as operating the Canal. Nevertheless, under the terms of the Treaty on the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Canal, often referred to as the Neutrality Treaty, the United States will have the right to use military force to reopen the canal or restore its operations.

Former Role and Presence of U.S. Troops. Over the years, U.S. military forces in Panama had several functions. The primary purpose of the troops was to provide for the defense of the Panama Canal, as set forth in the Panama Canal Treaties, until December 31, 1999. Another function served by the presence of the U.S. military in Panama stemmed from its activities throughout Latin America. Until late September 1997, Panama served as the headquarters of the U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM), a unified command responsible for all U.S. military operations south of Mexico. In March 1995, President Clinton announced that SOUTHCOM headquarters, located at Quarry Heights in Panama, would be moved to Miami. The move began in June 1997 and was completed by the end of September 1997. U.S. bases in Panama provided assistance to Latin American nations combating drug trafficking with aerial reconnaissance and counter-narcotics training. Howard Air Force Base in Panama provided secure staging for detection, monitoring, and intelligence collecting assets. Panama also provided unique opportunities and facilities for military training, including the Jungle Operations Training Center (which was deactivated on April 1, 1999) at Fort Sherman, Panama.

By the end of December 1999, all U.S. forces had withdrawn from Panama, and all of the U.S. bases and facilities had reverted to Panamanian control. Ten major installations were returned to Panama over a four-year period: Fort Davis and Fort Espinar in early September 1995; Fort Amador, at the Pacific entrance to the Canal, on October 1, 1996; Albrook Air Force Station on October 1, 1997; Galeta Island (a former U.S. Naval Security Group Activity that passed to Army control in 1995) on March 1, 1999; Rodman Naval Station on March 11, 1999; Fort Sherman, on the Atlantic side, on June 30, 1999; and Howard Air Force Base, which ceased air operations in May 1999, was officially turned over to Panama on November 1, 1999, along with Fort Kobbe. Finally, Fort Clayton was turned over on November 30, 1999.

Failed Negotiations. In September 1995, President Clinton and President Pérez Balladares met in Washington and announced that the two countries would begin informal discussions to determine if there was mutual interest in the United States maintaining a military presence in Panama beyond the end of 1999. Those talks never materialized, but instead there were a series of bilateral talks regarding a U.S. contribution to a Multinational Counternarcotics Center (MCC). President Pérez Balladares had announced in July 1996 that Panama would be willing to allow the United States to use Howard Air Force Base, at no cost, as an international drug interdiction center. He stated that Panama would “provide the facility free of charge as part of our contribution to the drug war.”

Talks on a potential MCC began in late November 1996 and ultimately led to a tentative agreement, announced December 24, 1997, on the establishment of a MCC with the United States contributing troops for the center. Despite the tentative accord, progress on a final agreement was stymied during 1998, and on September 25, 1998, both countries announced that they were ending the MCC talks without a final accord.

As described in the press, the MCC would have involved about 2,000 U.S. troops operating at Howard Air Force Base, Rodman Naval Station, and Fort Kobbe on the Pacific side of the Canal. Other facilities reportedly to be utilized would have been communication facilities at Galeta Island and Corozal. Panama would have provided free use of the bases, while the United States would have been expected to pay for such facilities as housing. The MCC reportedly would have been established for a 12-year period, renewable for additional five-year periods, with the potential participation of other Latin American nations. Reportedly the MCC would have had a Directors' Council made up of the foreign ministers of participating countries and presided over by Panama's foreign minister. If the United States and Panama had agreed on the MCC, the next step would have been for Panama's Legislative Assembly to approve the agreement, which then would have been subject to a national referendum in Panama.

As early as April 1998, the Clinton Administration had expressed concern that negotiations would have to be concluded soon, or the United States would be forced to locate the U.S. anti-drug operations elsewhere. Although the text of the draft MCC accord was not made public, press reports indicated that one problem in the negotiations was a provision that would permit U.S. soldiers to engage in other missions beyond counter-narcotics. Panama and several Latin American nations expected to join the MCC expressed reservations about this aspect of the accord, with concerns centered on the potential for U.S. military intervention in the region. U.S. officials, however, maintained that U.S. military activities beyond anti-narcotics work would consist of such benign activities as search and rescue and disaster relief. Another reported problem in the negotiations was the U.S. rejection of Panama's call to allow a change in the agreement, whereby the center could be dissolved after three years if the drug trafficking problem diminished.

Some participants, including former Ambassador Thomas McNamara, the lead negotiator in the talks with Panama, believe that the main reason that an agreement was not reached was Panama's internal politics. While Panamanian opinion polls overwhelmingly favored a continued U.S. military presence, the President appeared concerned about vocal opposition, even from within his own party, to the proposed center. Moreover, President Pérez Balladares was actively seeking a constitutional change for a second term of office, and this appeared to have influenced the MCC negotiations.

In early December 1998, U.S. officials announced that they had begun talks with several Latin American countries to find new bases of operation in Central and South America for the anti-drug missions formerly undertaken in Panama. Short-term interim agreements were concluded in April 1999 to have Forward Operating Locations (FOLs) in Ecuador, Aruba, and Curaçao for U.S. aerial counternarcotics missions. Subsequently, the United States concluded longer-term 10-year agreements

with Ecuador and with the Netherlands (for Aruba and Curaçao) for the anti-drug FOLs. An additional FOL site also was being sought in Central America, and on March 31, 2000, a 10-year agreement was signed with El Salvador.

In 1999, some Members of the U.S. Congress and politicians in Panama suggested that there was still an opportunity for the United States to negotiate the use of facilities in Panama for U.S. anti-drug flights, similar to the FOLs negotiated with Ecuador, Aruba, and Curacao. Press reports suggested that President-elect Moscoso was interested in allowing the U.S. military to use Panama as a staging area for anti-drug flights. In 2000, however, President Moscoso turned down a request from the United States for a visiting military forces agreement. On September 26, 2000, she announced that Panama would not participate in a visiting forces agreement with the United States.

U.S. Congressional Views on U.S. Military Presence. Before December 1999, Congress had twice gone on record favoring negotiations to consider a continued U.S. presence in Panama beyond the end of 1999, and in the 104th Congress the Senate approved a non-binding resolution on the issue. In 1991, Congress enacted legislation (P.L. 102-190, Section 3505) expressing the sense of Congress that the President should begin negotiations with Panama to consider whether the two nations should allow the permanent stationing of U.S. forces in Panama past 1999. Twelve years earlier, Congress had approved the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (P.L. 96-70, Section 1111) which states that “it is the sense of the Congress that the best interests of the United States require that the President enter into negotiations” with Panama “for the purpose of arranging for the stationing of United States military forces after the termination of the Panama Canal Treaty.” And on September 5, 1996, the Senate approved S.Con.Res. 14, expressing the sense of Congress that the President should negotiate a new base rights agreement with Panama, while consulting with Congress regarding any bilateral negotiations that take place.

In the 106th Congress, numerous measures were introduced relating to a continued U.S. military presence in Panama as the Canal turnover approached, but no legislative action was taken on these measures. The measures would have urged the President to negotiate a new base rights agreement with Panama to permit U.S. troops beyond December 31, 1999 (S.Con.Res. 59, S.J.Res. 37, H.Con.Res. 233); expressed the sense of the Congress that the United States should negotiate security arrangements with Panama to protect the Canal and to ensure Panama’s territorial integrity (H.Con.Res. 186/S.Con.Res. 61); authorized and directed the President to renegotiate the Panama Canal Treaties to provide for the security of the Canal (H.R. 2244); and expressed the sense of the Senate that the President should negotiate security arrangements with Panama regarding the protection of the Canal and that any attack on or against the Canal would be considered an act of war against the United States (S.Res. 257). One measure (H.R. 3452) would have provided that unpaid balances of the Panama Canal Commission be payable to Panama only upon completion of an agreement that leases half of Howard Air Force Base to the United States.

In the second session of the 106th Congress, H.R. 3673, introduced by Representative Benjamin Gilman, and reported by the House International Relations

Committee (H.Rept. 106-803, Part I), would have provided Panama with certain benefits if Panama agreed to permit the United States to maintain a presence there sufficient to carry out counternarcotics and related missions from Panama. The benefits would have been preferential trade access to the U.S. market; a scholarship program for Panamanians to study in the United States; and assistance for infrastructure construction. Supporters argued that the bill offered an opportunity for the United States to regain its traditional military presence in Panama and restore full U.S. military capability to perform anti-narcotics missions in the region. Opponents argued that Panama had not expressed interest in regaining a U.S. military presence in the country and believed that it could jeopardize talks underway with Panama for a “visiting forces” agreement. The State Department expressed opposition to the bill for several reasons. It maintained that there was a lack of credible support in Panama for any agreement to re-establish a U.S. military presence there; that the quid pro quo nature of the offer to Panama would give the appearance of the United States paying rent for the right to establish a military presence, and U.S. policy was not to pay rent for foreign bases or base rights; and that the trade benefits offered for Panama could violate the most-favored-nation obligation of the World Trade Organization. State Department officials also pointed out that trade benefits for Panama and other Caribbean Basin countries had been enacted into law in May 2000 as part of the U.S.-Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act (Title II of P.L. 106-200).

In the 107th Congress, just a single resolution was introduced related to the stationing of U.S. troops in Panama, but no legislative action was taken on the measure. H.Con.Res. 296, introduced by Representative Bob Barr on December 20, 2001, would have urged the President to negotiate a new base rights agreement with Panama in order for U.S. Armed Forces to be stationed there for purposes of defending the Canal.

In the 108th Congress, H.Con.Res. 9, introduced by Representative Virgil Goode, is identical to H.Con.Res. 296 introduced in the 107th Congress described above. The resolution would urge the President to negotiate a new base rights agreement with Panama for the purposes of defending the Panama Canal.

Panamanian Views on U.S. Military Presence. Prior to the departure of U.S. troops at the end of 1999, public opinion polls in Panama cited overwhelming support for a continued U.S. military presence. Some Panamanians focused on the importance of continuing a U.S. military presence to help conduct counternarcotics operations in Panama and in the region. They pointed with concern to incursions of Colombian narco-traffickers into the Darien jungle region of Panama. Despite the polls, Panamanian opponents to the MCC were vocal and staged protests at various times. In 1997, there were several protests by student, human rights, and labor groups who opposed a continued U.S. presence. An umbrella organization was formed known as the Organizations Against Military Bases, which included some 30 labor, peasant, and student groups. In early 1998 another umbrella organization against U.S. military presence was formed, the National Movement for the Defense of Sovereignty, consisting of labor, student, and professional organizations. These groups argued for the need to break what they regarded as Panama’s dependent relationship with the United States and recover its own national identity.

Figure 1. Map of Panama



Source: Map Resources. Adapted by CRS.